BS 2506 .L63 1927
**Lock, Walter, 1846-1933.**
St. Paul, the master-builder : being lectures delivered to the clergy of the diocese of St. Asaph in July, 1897

BERTRAND SMITH
ACRES OF BOOKS
240 LONG BEACH BLVD.
LONG BEACH, CALIF.

1.

# ST. PAUL
# THE MASTER-BUILDER

παράνομος εἶ; ἐννόησον τὸν βλάσφημον Παῦλον καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εὐαγγελιστὴν· πρότερον πορθοῦντα τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πιστευόμενον τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν· πρότερον ἐκκόπτοντα τὰς ἀμπέλους, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα φυτουργὸν γενόμενον· πρότερον καθαιροῦντα τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα οἰκοδομοῦντα.

S. Joh. Damasc., *Sacra Parallela*, 587.

# ST. PAUL
# THE MASTER-BUILDER

BEING LECTURES DELIVERED TO
THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF
ST. ASAPH IN JULY, 1897

BY

WALTER LOCK, D.D.

LADY MARGARET PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

FOURTH EDITION

METHUEN & CO. LTD.
36 ESSEX STREET W.C.
LONDON

2506
.L63
1927

*First Published* . . . . *September 1899*
*Second Edition* . . . . *February 1905*
*Third Edition* . . . . *October 1910*
*Fourth Edition* . . . . *1927*

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND

WATKIN HERBERT WILLIAMS, D.D.

FORMERLY BISHOP OF BANGOR

TO WHOSE LIBERALITY

AND LOVE OF CHRISTIAN LEARNING

THESE LECTURES WERE DUE

I DEDICATE THEM

WITH GRATITUDE AND RESPECT

# PREFACE

THESE four Lectures were delivered in the summer of 1897, at a time when an unexpected loss and unexpected tasks prevented me from an adequate preparation, and they were then delivered from notes. I consequently hesitated very much to publish them, but I was pressed to do so by some of those who heard them, especially by one, whose request was, under the circumstances, almost equivalent to a command, and I have at length found time to put them into shape. They appear almost exactly as they were delivered, except that in the last Lecture I have borrowed a few paragraphs from a sermon

of my own on a cognate subject, preached before the University in the winter of the same year, and printed in the *Oxford Magazine* for December 8th, 1897.

WALTER LOCK

KEBLE COLLEGE
*19th January*, 1899

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

THIS Second Edition is little more than a reprint of the first. I have altered an inaccurate statement on page 41, corrected a few slight misprints, and have also ventured to add the hymn which is printed on pages xi. and xii.

WALTER LOCK

KEBLE COLLEGE
*5th January*, 1905

# CONTENTS


| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | THE MISSIONARY . . . . | 1 |
| II. | THE ECCLESIASTICAL STATESMAN . . | 38 |
| III. | THE ETHICAL TEACHER—JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH . . . . | 68 |
| IV. | THE ETHICAL TEACHER—THE MORAL LAW | 94 |

# A HYMN FOR ST. PAUL'S DAY

BOUNTEOUS Spirit, who dost give
Life and breath to all that live,
Hear us who uplift to-day
To Thy throne our grateful lay
For the crowning gift of all,
For our master-builder, Paul.

Pride of lineage, pride of race,
Hope of fame and foremost place,
Nobler pride in blameless youth,
All he sacrificed for Truth,
Deemed them loss for Jesu's name,
Took His cross and bore its shame.

Like a branch within the vine,
Did his life with Christ's entwine;
One with Him, he bore afresh
Jesu's dying in his flesh,
In Him lived and in Him taught,
In His power each wonder wrought.

Quickened in each fainting hour
By Christ's Resurrection power,
Through each peril on he pressed,
And from East to furthest West
Taught the whole world to confess
Christ the Fount of Righteousness.

To one Saviour's feet he drew
Sinful Gentile, scornful Jew,
Wisely bonded stone to stone
Till he made the Temple one,
Till one faith, one hope, one bread
Linked one body to its Head.

Bounteous Spirit, who dost give
Life and breath to all who live,
Breathe, oh breathe on us, that we
In Thine own good time may be
One again, as Thou art one
With the Father and the Son.

W. L.

# ST. PAUL
## THE MASTER-BUILDER

### I.

### THE MISSIONARY

IT is not, I presume, necessarily required of your lecturer on this occasion that he should lay before you the results of original research on his own part. The object of this series of annual lectures is rather that you should have opportunities of hearing of the chief advances which have been recently made in the study of theology or the interpretation of the Bible, and that lines should be pointed out along which your own private studies may be carried in the coming twelve months. That is all

at which I aim, but that is in itself important, for it may be doubted whether there ever was a time in which it was so impossible to rest and be thankful with the training which we received at the time of our ordination,—so keen is the interest in theological studies, so much fresh light has been poured and is being poured upon the criticism and interpretation of Holy Scripture.

The Old Testament is, indeed, the sphere in which this is most true; but, if we confine ourselves to the study of St. Paul's Epistles, we shall find much to learn. For instance, we were accustomed thirty years ago to regard Bishop Lightfoot as having said the last word on those Epistles on which he published a Commentary; yet now doubt has been thrown upon his conclusions in several points to which he devoted special attention.

It has been made almost certain that, in the *Commentary on the Epistle to the*

*Galatians*, he took the wrong view as to the geographical situation of the Churches of Galatia,* and his identification of the visit described in Gal. ii. with that in Acts xv. has been seriously challenged.† In his estimate of the Colossian heresy it has been made probable that he has greatly exaggerated its associations with Gnosticism.‡ His interpretation of the Prætorium in Phil. i. 13 as meaning "the Prætorian guard," which was adopted in the Revised Version, will probably be surrendered in favour of Mommsen's suggestion, that it means the officers of the Supreme Imperial Court before whom St. Paul was tried.§ Again, the chronology of St. Paul's life has been carefully re-examined by several students,

* *v. infra*, pp. 14–17.

† RAMSAY, *St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, ch. iii.; but see also *The Expositor*, 1896, I., pp. 81, 174, 253; II., 43, 56.

‡ HORT, *Judaistic Christianity*, pp. 116–129.

§ *Sitzungsberichte d. Berlin. Akad. der Wissenschaft*, 1895, May 30th. *Zur Apostelgeschichte*, 28, 16, p. 8.

*Cf.* RAMSAY, *St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 357.

all of whom put the events rather earlier than Bishop Lightfoot had done, so that it is possible that he should have reached Rome at least as early as 59 A.D., have been released after two years' imprisonment, have paid his intended visit to Spain, have written the Pastoral Epistles, and been martyred in the Neronian persecution of 64 A.D.*

To this fresh knowledge two English writers have made the chief contributions: Professor Ramsay, of Aberdeen, and the late Dr. Hort, of Cambridge. Of these Professor Ramsay has the great advantage that he has been St. Paul's fellow-traveller: he has travelled over the same ground both in Asia Minor and Greece, and like Abercius, whose epitaph he has helped to restore, he has travelled "having Paul with him," with St. Paul's Epistles in his hands, with the presence of St. Paul ever at his side; and this experience, combined

* *v.* "Chronology of the New Testament," by C. H. TURNER, in HASTING'S *Dictionary of the Bible.*

with a rare acquaintance with the inscriptions of the time, and with penetrating insight, always subtle, always alert, though, perhaps, at times over-subtle, over-confident, and rather capricious in dealing with the texts, has made his two books, *The Church and the Roman Empire* and *St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, the most interesting, stimulating, and illuminating treatment which St. Paul's work has ever received.

Dr. Hort's work is only that of the student, but of a student absolutely loyal to the texts which he has to interpret, chivalrously devoted to the quest of truth, whether it be the narrower truth of the exact exegesis of language or the wider truth of theology, which combines all various aspects of knowledge in the unity of life; a student so hypercritically critical of his own work that he published but little in his life, and his contributions to the understanding of St. Paul are all to be found in posthumous works, pub-

lished by able and devoted pupils, yet necessarily lacking the last touch of the master's hand, who

> "Weighed every word with patient care
> Lest taint of error linger there."

Three of these posthumous works bear upon our subject. In *Judaistic Christianity* a careful account is given of the relation of Christianity to Judaism, of the attitude of the Jewish Christians to it, and of the treatment of them by St. Paul. In *The Romans and Ephesians* we have the best statement I know of the origin of those two Epistles, and the best defence of the genuineness of the latter by showing how it both corresponds with and supplements the former. In *The Christian Ecclesia* we have an examination of the history and usage of the word ἐκκλησία, which throws fresh light on many passages of the New Testament, and which, even if it exaggerates the absence of ordered government in the early Church, yet raises

above all narrow and individualistic ideas of Christianity the conception of a visible Catholic society.* To these two authors the following lectures are constantly indebted. I would also draw your attention to a short but most suggestive essay on "St. Paul and Hellenism," by Canon Hicks,† to the thorough and scholarlike interpretation of the great Christological passage, Phil. ii. 5–11, by Dr. Gifford,‡ and to the valuable excursuses in the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, published by Dr. Sanday and Mr. Headlam.

The general result of this recent study has been twofold: it has resulted in a confirmation of our trust in St. Luke as the biographer of St. Paul; he is seen

* *Judaistic Christianity* (Macmillan & Co.), 1894. *Prolegomena to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and the Ephesians* (Macmillan & Co.), 1895. *The Christian Ecclesia* (Macmillan & Co.), 1897. A criticism of the assumptions of this last book will be found in MOBERLY'S *Ministerial Priesthood*, pp. xiv., xv.

† *Studia Biblica*, iv. pp. 1–14.

‡ *The Incarnation* (Hodder & Stoughton), 1897.

not only as a loyal friend of the Apostle, but also as a loyal interpreter of the facts of Church History. The Acts of the Apostles are proved to be historical, not so much by the less important proof that they are quoted in other early writings, but because they imply a knowledge of the geography and the history of the countries through which St. Paul moved, and exhibit a clear intelligible narrative, consonant in all its main outlines with the conditions of the Roman Empire and the facts of the Christian Church.

The other result is a truer conception of the work and character of St. Paul. We see him not merely as an enthusiastic missionary, but as one who laid out his journeys by a clear policy and a definite plan. We see him not as a partisan champion of the cause of the Gentiles, but as "a great ecclesiastical statesman," trying to weld Jew and Gentile together in the unity of a Catholic Church. We see him once more not only as a great

teacher of the doctrine of justification by faith, but also as the constructive architect of a great system of Christian ethics. To-day I propose to point out a few characteristics of his work as a missionary.

1. Let us notice, first, the evidence of a definite policy underlying the course of his journeys. It would not surprise us if the reverse had been the case: if one who had become a Christian by a sudden conversion, one who was intensely conscious that he had been called, not by man nor through man, but by Jesus Christ Himself, should have felt authorised to preach in season and out of season, at the hint of impulse, without submission to human guidance or the calculations of reason. But this has not been the usual Christian method. The history of the Acts of the Apostles tells us of the great outpouring of an enthusiastic impulse to preach the gospel to all nations; but it is only by very gradual steps that the impulse is translated into action. The Christian Church was

thrown open little by little; first Samaritans, half Jew by birth and half Jew by religion, were admitted into it; then the Ethiopian eunuch and the Roman centurion, neither akin to the Jews by birth, but both loosely attached to Judaism by religion, were baptised; and finally, either at Antioch in Syria* or at Antioch in Pisidia, Gentiles proper, alien to Judaism both by kinship and by faith, were treated as capable of receiving full Christian privileges. The Acts of the Apostles is the history of an impulse guided by reason and converted into the mainspring of a regulated life.

So was it with the impulse that stirred St. Paul at his conversion. It was condensed into quiet resolve and reasoned doctrine during a period of three years' retirement; these were followed by unobtrusive work for eight or ten years in and around his native city, Tarsus, work which has left no mark on our

* Acts xi. 20, if "Greeks" (Ἕλληνας) is the right reading in that passage, or Acts xiii. 46.

literary documents. Then followed the direct missionary work to which he was called by St. Barnabas, and for which the two were formally commissioned by the Church of Antioch.

It is in these journeys that we can trace definite lines of policy. In the first of them the two Apostles pass through the island of Cyprus, cross the sea to Pamphylia, then strike up over the range of Mount Taurus into Pisidia and Lycaonia. The primary aim here is clear: each apostle seeks to evangelise his own native country; they go home to their friends to tell them the great things the Lord hath done. St. Barnabas is at first the leader, and they therefore pass first to Cyprus; then they pass over to Pamphylia, a region in close contact with Cilicia, St. Paul's native province; but here their plans seem changed. There is nothing in the narrative which explains this sudden turning northwards, but the language of Gal. iv. 13, "Ye know that because of an infirmity of the flesh

I preached the gospel unto you at the first time," seems to refer to this occasion; and we are justified in assuming that St. Paul, on reaching the coast of Asia Minor, was attacked by some illness,—possibly by an attack of epilepsy; possibly, as Professor Ramsay suggests, by the malarial fever so common in that district;—that he was obliged on medical grounds to seek the highland country to recruit his strength, and that, therefore, the original plan of the journey was changed by the overruling of Providence.

In the second journey the plan is more distinctively Pauline. The first object is to cover the old ground and to strengthen the faith of those converted in the first journey. St. Barnabas and St. Paul separate from each other, but to this extent they follow the same policy; St. Barnabas returns to Cyprus, St. Paul returns to Pisidia and Lycaonia. But when this is accomplished St. Paul strikes out a bolder line; with Silas and Timothy he passes through the Phry-

gian and Galatian country in the direction of Asia. But here they did not preach, being "forbidden of the Holy Ghost"; they attempt to enter the Roman province of Bithynia, but again the "Spirit of Jesus" suffered them not; they pass quickly through Mysia to the sea-coast, and at Troas their course is finally decided by a vision. They pass over into the Roman province of Macedonia, evangelise its chief towns, then pass into the Roman province of Achaia, staying at its two chief towns, Athens and Corinth, and making the latter, the seat of Roman Government, their chief centre of work for a year and a half.

The policy then seems to have been to Christianise the Roman Empire, passing along the Roman highways, guided by the political divisions of the Roman provinces, working mainly in the towns, the centres of Roman government. It is in connection with this plan that the discussion of the exact meaning of the term "Galatia" becomes important. The word is capable of

two meanings. It may be used in an ethnological sense as the country of the Galatians proper, a large, thinly-populated district in the north-east of Asia Minor, lying off the line of travel which St. Paul would have followed on his way to Greece. This is the view advocated by Bishop Lightfoot, and it certainly remains a possible view; but it implies a digression on the part of St. Paul made for reasons unknown to us, and the result is that we know absolutely nothing of these "Churches of Galatia" to which the Epistle to the Galatians was addressed.

The alternative view is that Galatia is used in a political sense, denoting the Roman province of Galatia, which included and took its name from the ethnographical Galatia, but also extended southward and embraced the districts of Pisidia and Lycaonia.

Now on this disputed point the Acts of the Apostles throws no clear light. Its author never uses the substantive Galatia

nor speaks of the Galatians; he only refers to a district which he calls "the region of Phrygia and Galatia" (xvi. 6, *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*), "the region of Galatia and Phrygia" (xviii. 23, *τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν*), an ambiguous phrase, which may very well mean the district bordering on Galatia and Phrygia, and which, therefore, is quite indecisive.

We are therefore thrown back on evidence supplied by St. Paul's Epistles or any other external source, and from them several lines of evidence converge to support the second view. Thus St. Paul's use of the terms Asia, Achaia, Macedonia, Illyricum, though in many cases the allusions are indecisive, yet on the whole favours the theory that they mean the political divisions of the Roman Empire.* Again, the title "Galatians" (Gal. iii. 1), though applicable to the first

* Asia (Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; 2 Cor. i. 8; 2 Tim. i. 15), Macedonia (Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. ii. 13; vii. 5; viii. 1; xi. 9; Phil. iv. 15; 1 Thess. i. 7; iv. 10), Achaia (Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. i. 1; ix. 2; xi. 10; 1 Thess. i. 7), Illyricum (Rom. xv. 19).

theory, is equally applicable to the second, as it would be a natural and courteous form of address from a Roman citizen to inhabitants of Pisidia and Lycaonia; indeed it was the only common title that would have embraced them all. Again, St. Paul on his third missionary journey made a great effort to induce his Gentile Churches to contribute to the relief of the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem. The Churches of Macedonia, Achaia, Galatia, are all mentioned as contributing to this fund, but on the North Galatian theory the Churches of Pisidia and Lycaonia, St. Paul's first Gentile Churches, which he had twice visited, would never be mentioned as furnishing their quota; on the South Galatian theory they would be included under the title "the Churches of Galatia." Again, early Church History supplies no traces of churches existing in North Galatia. When we add to these points the further consideration that South Galatia lies on the natural route of St. Paul's second journey, and that the Epistle to the Galatians

gains many new points when read in the light of this theory, the balance of argument is preponderatingly in its favour. The Churches of Galatia are then, probably, the Churches of Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe. We have to picture the Epistle as addressed not to a few scattered agricultural congregations in a wide district, but to the comparatively educated congregations of three or four towns within easy distance of each other. On this view the visit to Galatia forms no exception to the general Roman policy of the journey.*

We return, then, to consider that plan, and ask ourselves why it fell to the lot of St. Paul, rather than to that of any other apostle, to strike out a policy so far-reaching in scope, so pregnant with results.

The answer is that St. Paul alone was

* For this discussion *cf.* LIGHTFOOT, Galatians, Introduction, i., ii. RAMSAY, *The Church and the Roman Empire*, capp. ii. and vi. *Studia Biblica*, iv. pp. 15–57. *The Expositor*, 1893 and 1894 (articles by Mr. Chase, Professor Ramsay, and Dr. Gifford).

born a Roman citizen. This implies probably that St. Paul's father or grandfather or great-grandfather had done some signal service to the Roman Government, in return for which he had received the gift of citizenship for himself and his descendants. It was probably the result of this that he bore the Gentile name Paul as well as the Jewish name Saul. This was not uncommon at this time; thus the Jew John bore also the Roman name Marcus (Acts xii. 12), the Jew Jesus bore the Roman name Justus (Col. iv. 11), as did also another Jew, Joseph Barsabas (Acts i. 23). The Gentile name may either have been given at the circumcision for convenience of intercourse with Gentiles; or possibly when the boy Saul came of age he may have been formally entered on a list of Roman citizens kept by the Roman official at Tarsus, and may, as Professor Ramsay suggests, have been named not only Paullus, but on the analogy of ordinary Roman nomenclature he may have had a

threefold name — prænomen, nomen, and cognomen. St. Paul, then, would have grown up, unlike all the other apostles—how unlike Simon the Zealot, the enthusiastic Galilæan opponent of Roman rule!—in boyhood and youth proud of his ancestral connection with the empire. When he came of age he would enjoy the privilege that he could never be condemned by any magistrate without a chance of making his defence (*cf.* Acts xvi. 37; xxii. 25); he would enjoy the right of holding property in any part of the Roman Empire, of trading with Roman citizens, of marrying a Roman wife. It is not, however, true to say that he would have gained by his citizenship the right of appeal to the Emperor; that right he had, but it was common to all provincials, whether Roman citizens or not; that right St. Peter and all the apostles enjoyed, the other rights they did not share.

This ancestral pride in Rome was brought out into a conscious influence upon his life by his first appearance before a Roman

governor. At Paphos in Cyprus he stood before the proconsul Sergius Paulus, a namesake of his own, possibly (if Paul's father had received his citizenship through the hands of one of the Roman Paulli) distantly connected with the Roman to whom his family owed their citizenship; in his presence St. Paul rebuked the false representative of a degraded Judaism and won the allegiance of the proconsul. St. Luke marks the significance of the moment by bringing forward for the first time the Gentile name Paul (Acts xiii. 9); from that moment onward that is the only name used, and Paul becomes the leader, taking precedence of Barnabas. He may well have been encouraged by this success to believe that his Christian message would win the allegiance of the whole empire. A fresh point of contact with Rome was supplied by his friendship with Aquila and Priscilla, formed at Corinth in the second missionary journey, renewed apparently at Ephesus in the third journey, and issuing in the strong overmaster-

ing desire to see Rome itself (Acts xviii. 2, 26; xix. 21); the imprisonment at Rome falls after the missionary work and need not detain us here. It is enough to see now that this pride in Roman citizenship inspired the great hope of the conversion of the Roman Empire; dictated the lines along which he moved to that conversion; made him anxious, later on in his life, to visit Rome itself and to reach Spain, the western limit of the empire; gave him his confidence in appealing to Roman authority to protect him against the violence of the populace; led him, first of all the writers of the New Testament, to emphasise the Divine authority of civil government; and, finally, gave him a mould out of which was drawn his conception of the Church as a great universal spiritual empire.

Thus, in ways of which perhaps even St. Paul was scarcely conscious, the Christian Church was being guided to be the ally and the successor of the Roman Empire in its great task of civilization. To what extent

this is true may be seen if we summarise Professor Ramsay's account of the aims of the Roman emperors in dealing with the countries of Asia Minor.*

(*a*) Rome attempted to naturalise the Greek language and civilization throughout Asia. It found Greek already making its way among the many native dialects, adopted it as its official language, and so promoted unity of feeling by unity of speech. The Christian preachers fell in entirely with this tendency; they used the Greek translation of the Old Testament Scriptures; they preached in Greek; they wrote their letters in Greek. The Epistles of St. John, the First Epistle of St. Peter, the letters to the Seven Churches in the Apocalypse, the letters of St. Paul to the Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, Timothy, and Philemon, and the fourth Gospel are all connected with Asia Minor, and are all written in Greek. To this naturalisation of the Greek language the Christian Church soon added a system

* RAMSAY, *St. Paul the Traveller*, c. vi.

of education far in advance of anything which the Romans had achieved, for it was of the essence of Christianity that ignorance was no longer to be associated with worship, that God was knowable, that Christianity revealed Him to the comprehension of men. St. Paul's speech at Athens was "the solemn unfolding of the gospel as the sanction and fulfilment of knowledge in the metropolis of the human search for truth,"* and the circulation of the writings of the apostles, and the public reading of them and of the Old Testament, formed a constant education of all converts to the Church.

(*b*) The empire aimed at a political and religious unity. It tried to break down the narrow tribal divisions and to substitute for them the larger unit of the province: as we have seen, Pisidians, Lycaonians, and Galatians found themselves grouped under the one title Galatians. Again, the direct worship

* HORT, *Hulsean Lectures*, p. 63.

of the genius of the empire, as embodied in the worship of the Emperor, took its place side by side with the native and Greek worships, supplementing and at times supplanting their local influence by its common appeal to all subjects of the empire. With this tendency also the Christian Church co-operated. St. Paul groups his churches by their provinces; the subsequent arrangement of bishoprics and archbishoprics followed the political divisions of the later empire, and the common worship of the one God and Saviour Jesus Christ put the crown upon the growing unity.

(*c*) The Roman influence tended to strengthen the marriage tie and the social bonds of the family in opposition to the lower morality of many of the Asiatic religions. A religion which sprang out of Judaism would naturally ally itself with this attempt, and our Lord had deliberately raised the obligations of the marriage tie and the reverence for home life far above the

level of the best Judaism. Hence the first great effort of all Christian preachers was to raise the standard of purity, and both St. Paul and St. Peter attempted to organise family life in the Asiatic churches upon a Christian basis.

But in all these respects the policy of the Roman Empire was not new; it entered into the inheritance of Alexander the Great, and helped to fulfil the ambitions of Hellenism. Here is an independent description of the aims of Hellenism.

"What then was Hellenism? It meant (*a*) a breaking down of the barriers of race. We realise this in a moment when we read of the wonderful wedding feast made by Alexander at Susa, in February, 324 B.C., when he and his chief captains, to the number of nearly one hundred, all married Persian wives on one day. . . . Henceforward the East should wed the West.

"(*b*) Hellenism involved, as Alexander conceived it, a breaking down of the narrow

politics of the Greek cities. Just after the Susa wedding feast he sent Nicanor to the Olympian festival of August, 324, to proclaim the return of all political exiles to their own cities throughout Greece. . . The old Greek political landmarks were for ever swept away; the cities became merged in monarchies.

"(*c*) Hellenism meant further, the universal spread of Greek language and culture.

"(*d*) Hellenism (once more) meant a fusion of religions. Wherever Alexander went he paid reverence to the local deities. The Gods of Greece followed him to Susa and Babylon, and the teeming brood of the Nile, Serapis, Isis, Osiris, and the rest, soon learned the Greek tongue, and found a home wherever Hellenism went.

"Hellenism meant fusion of race, unity of language, union of cities in a great monarchy, religious toleration and comprehension."*

St. Paul then is the successor of Alexander

* Canon E. L. HICKS in *Studia Biblica*, iv. p. 2.

the Great, as well as of Julius and Augustus Cæsar. But we may trace the pedigree a branch further back. Whence had Alexander gained this great conception? The answer may be well given in the words of Plutarch.

"The ideal constitution of Zeno, the founder of Stoicism, centres in this one point. He aims at inducing us, to whatever nation we belong, not to live each in his own city or district, separated off by our distinctive rights, but to think of all men as fellow-citizens and members of the same district, that so there may be one life and one order, like one herd of cattle pasturing in one meadow under a common law. Now Zeno did nothing more than sketch this as a dream or a philosopher's Utopia, but Alexander gave reality to the idea. For, in spite of Aristotle's frequent advice, he refused to act in one way to Greeks, in another to barbarians; he would not be a constitutional ruler to the one, an absolute despot to the others; he would not care for the one as though they were his friends and

kinsmen, while treating the others as nothing better than animals or vegetables; and so he did not fill his reign with frequent wars and routs and those seditions which betray a rottenness beneath an empire's surface. Nay, he regarded himself as sent from heaven to be the reconciler and peacemaker of the world, and therefore he combined all whom he could by force of winning words, and the rest by force of arms, drawing all from the most distant parts of the world to one centre. As in a loving cup he mixed together customs, marriages, manner of life, and ordered all to think of the whole world as their native land, of the camp as the citadel and garrison in that land, and to treat the good in all lands as their kinsmen, and only the evil as of alien race. He told them that the Greek was not to be distinguished from the barbarian by the weapons that he used or the dress that he wore, but that manliness was the test of the Greek, cowardice of the barbarian." *

* PLUTARCH, *De Alexandri Magni Fortunâ*, c. 6.

Such then is one line of the pedigree which issued in the Christian Church; first, the ideal cosmopolitanism of Stoic philosophy emphasising the brotherhood of humanity, then the deliberate attempt of Alexander to fuse East and West under one military monarchy. This was cut short indeed by his premature death, but taken up and carried forward over the area of a wider world by the Roman Empire, until it is consecrated in the universal brotherhood of the Christian Church.

It is necessarily impossible to say to what extent St. Paul was conscious of the work which he was accomplishing; the speech at Athens proves a real acquaintance with the main theses of the Stoic philosophy; he was a citizen of one of the chief centres of Hellenistic culture; his pride in his Roman citizenship would have given him an instinctive sympathy with its world-wide aims; his conception of the Christian Church is as wide in its scope as that of the empire. Beyond this we need not go;

just as the forces of language are greater than even the conscious meaning of poet and prophet, so the forces of history are greater than the conscious aims of statesman or even of a Christian apostle. The poet and prophet utter words more far-reaching than they themselves suspect; the acts of the statesman are woven into a web of which he only dimly guesses the pattern. To poet, prophet, and statesman alike "thoughts beyond their thoughts" are given.

2. The second point of St. Paul's method springs naturally out of the first. His aim seems to have been to concentrate his efforts on the chief towns, and so to have a few strong centres from which Christianity could radiate out into the neighbouring countries. The Christian Church had started into real corporate existence in the city of Jerusalem, and this remained the chief city to St. Paul through all his work. To Jerusalem he went of his own accord to visit St. Peter; to Jerusalem he was sent by the Church of

Antioch for the decision of the question about the status of the Gentile converts; he stirred up his Gentile converts throughout the world to help the poor saints at Jerusalem; to Jerusalem he hurried back that he might be present at the feasts, partly because he was so anxious to keep in touch with the Jewish Christians there, partly, perhaps, because he would at such times meet Jewish Christians from all quarters of the world, and could take counsel with them about the spread of the gospel.*

Antioch, in Syria, was the second great Christian city — the centre of his Gentile work, from which he started for his missionary journeys, and to which he returned after them;† but in this case, as in that of Jerusalem, the city was a strong centre of Christianity before St. Paul's own action. In the course of his own work three cities stand out most promi-

* Gal. i. 18; ii. 1; Rom. xv. 25–31; Acts xviii. 21 (?); xx. 16.

† Acts xiii. 1; xiv. 26; xv. 35; xviii. 22.

nent, Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome; the Church at Corinth, at which he stayed for eighteen months in his second journey, became the nucleus of other bodies of Christians throughout the whole of Achaia,* and a stay of more than two years at Ephesus in the third journey resulted in the evangelisation of the whole of the Roman province of Asia, and the formation of Churches such as those at Colossæ, Laodicea, and Hierapolis.† It is further clear that of his own free will he had intended to make Rome, the great world centre, into a Christian centre from which its light might go forth to the West.‡ That was to be "if he were prospered by the will of God to come unto them." And so it proved, though in a way far different from that which he had planned; he arrived at Rome a prisoner, but his tribulations became the glory of the Gentile Churches, and even more than he expected

* 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1.
† Acts xix. 10; Col. i. 2; ii. 1; iv. 13.
‡ Acts xix. 21; Rom. i. 10; xv. 28.

(μᾶλλον) the things which happened unto him fell out to the progress of the gospel.*

3. Trust in his fellow-helpers is another note of St. Paul's work. His was a sympathetic nature, depending on the sympathy of others and giving out his whole-hearted sympathy to them, throwing open the doors of his heart that there might be room for all his converts. The last chapter of the Epistle to the Romans is a striking illustration of this mutual trustfulness, and his relations with his immediate fellow-workers exhibit it at its highest. They influence him and are influenced and trusted by him. The intercourse with Aquila and Priscilla seems to lead up to the desire to see Rome; the intercourse with Apollos, an Alexandrian by race, perhaps accounts for the tone and style of the later Epistles with their kinship to that of the Alexandrian philosophy; the intercourse with St. Luke may explain the large amount of similarity between the phraseology

* Eph. iii. 13; Phil. i. 12.

of the Pastoral Epistles and that of St. Luke's writings. On the other hand, Timothy is entrusted with the task of comforting the Thessalonian and the Philippian Churches in their persecutions, and Titus with the more difficult reconciliation of the disputes at Corinth. Such temporary missions were like the early mission of the twelve by our Lord in His Galilæan ministry, and as that led up to the lifelong apostolate, so these led up to the fuller and more autocratic missions of Timothy to Ephesus, and of Titus to Crete, and through them to the lifelong episcopate.

4. Lastly, from very early times in his work St. Paul felt the necessity of a control and discipline over the Churches, to be exercised through organised ministers. Such organisation was formed as soon as his own personal influence was being removed from his converts. Thus the ordaining of elders in the Churches of Pisidia and Lycaonia did not take place at the first visit when he contemplated a speedy return, but when the

journey was over.* It was when he was convinced that the elders of the Church at Ephesus would see his face no more that he laid special stress upon their work as "bishops";† and these instances lead naturally up to the stress on organisation which is found in the Pastoral Epistles.

It is probable that we scarcely realise the effect produced upon the Apostles when they first faced the probability that the Lord would not return in their lifetime, and that they must make provision for the Churches when they themselves were gone. We see one effect in the literature of the New Testament. St. Paul's two greatest doctrinal statements were drawn out from him when face to face with the danger of death; the Epistle to the Romans when he was in danger of plots from the Jews at Corinth and uncertain what fate awaited him at the hands of those who were "disobedient in Judæa"; the Epistle to the Ephesians when he was expecting to stand before the Im-

* Acts xiv. 23. † Acts xx. 17, 28.

perial Court at Rome. St. Peter in the same way gave diligence that his converts after his departure (ἔξοδος) might be able to call to remembrance the facts of the gospel.* It is therefore quite in accordance with this that the Pastoral Epistles should exhibit a greater anxiety that the ministerial organisation of the various Churches should be more fixed, and rest more firmly on a moral basis.

Such was the Apostle as a missionary. He was, and he claimed to be, inspired by the Holy Spirit; he listened for and heard that Spirit's guidance, but that guidance was not capricious, fitful, or unintelligent; it sprang out of the dictates of true human feeling and wise human judgment. The bidding of natural affection led him first to preach to his own home; the instincts of a Roman citizen led him to follow the methods of the Roman Empire; the natural wisdom of a leader of men, looking forward to a distant future, led him to strengthen his

* 2 St. Peter i. 15.

centres, to enlarge and to trust loyally his body of fellow-workers, to organise and discipline the spiritual life of his converts. And therefore he remains still for us the type of the true missionary. Our Church too should follow the lines of our empire; it must not be narrower in its scope; it must choose its centres wisely; it must trust those whom it converts; it must organise them on a moral basis; it must aid, foster, guide the new churches until they stand in their own strength, knit to the Mother Church by the ties of a common faith and a common sympathy.

## II.

# THE ECCLESIASTICAL STATESMAN

THE work of the statesman is essentially the work of preserving unity among the people whom he essays to guide. It is his task, in the words of Demosthenes,* "to see troubles in their first germ, to anticipate them, to forewarn the rest of his countrymen; nay, more, to compress within the smallest possible compass the natural and necessary failings of bodies politic, slackness, delay, ignorance, jealousies, and to turn every one to good feeling and friendship and enthusiasm for duty."

The object of this lecture will be to show what was St. Paul's contribution to this task, how he helped to form that strong

* *De Corona*, p. 309, A.

sense of Catholic Unity which is the chief mark of the Christian Church in the second century.

Now, when we consider the origin of this sense of unity we ultimately reach a choice between two alternative theories: *either* the unity is the result of a deliberate federation of congregations primarily independent, to be compared with the political unity which connects England, Scotland, and Ireland: *or* it is an original unity, implied in the essential conception of the Church, which extended itself in every quarter, which threw out branches in this direction and in that, but all in conscious dependence on the root, so that there never could be any question of uniting together, but only questions of settling the mutual relations of the parts of one whole. Such a unity is to be compared with that of a family, scattered perhaps throughout the whole world, but essentially one through its descent from a common ancestor. The last of these views seems to me

the true one, and that for four different reasons.

1. The associations of the word which our Lord used to designate His Church, the *Ecclesia*, confirm this view.

The word is indeed the ordinary Greek word for the public assembly of a Greek city (*cf.* Acts xix. 41), and this association would not by itself favour this view. But a Jewish association had given a further colour to the word. "The Ecclesia of the New Testament takes its name and primary idea from the Ecclesia of the Old Testament," * and the LXX. had taken the word ἐκκλησία to translate two Hebrew words, *qāhāl*, an assembly, a gathering together for a particular purpose, of men or of nations, and *'ēdhāh*, the whole society or body of Israelites, whether assembled or not assembled. Such was the primary distinction, though in the later books of the Old Testament *qāhāl* also

* HORT, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 3. The whole of this section is indebted to Dr. Hort's first lecture, in which fuller illustrations will be found.

was used in the sense of *'ēdhāh*, and ἐκκλησία took over the fuller sense of the latter word. "Both words suggested no mere agglomeration of men, but rather a unity carried out by a joint action of many members, each having his own responsibilities, the action of each and all being regulated by a supreme law or order."* Now, our Lord chose as the word for the Christian body which He was creating *not* συναγωγή, which emphasises the thought of gathering, *nor* λαός, "people," which emphasises the racial distinction which separated the Jews from other races, but ἐκκλησία, which, in the fuller sense of *'ēdhāh*, emphasises the unity. "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church" —My *Ecclesia*, not My *synagogue* or My *people; My* Ecclesia, which is to correspond to "the Ecclesia of God," hitherto identified with the race of Israel.

In Acts xx. 28 we have a use of the word by St. Paul, which affords an interesting example of the way in which the

* *Ib.*, p. 15.

meaning may oscillate between the narrower and the wider sense, "Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops, to feed the Church of God which He purchased with His own blood." Here the Church of God is, in relation to the Ephesian presbyters, the local congregation at Ephesus, which alone it was their duty to feed, but in relation to God it is the whole Church throughout the world, which He had purchased; and it is to be noticed that in this wider allusion St. Paul seems to be consciously adapting to the new condition the language of Psalm lxxiv. 2. The Psalmist had said, "Remember Thy congregation (συναγωγήν) which Thou hast purchased of old." St. Paul alters *congregation* into *Church*, and thereby emphasises more clearly the common life. Thus the word is associated with a national unity; the analogy of Israel suggests no federation of twelve tribes into a single monarchy, but a blood-union, separated only by local tribal divisions.

2. We have seen in the preceding lecture how the Roman Empire and its system influenced the missionary work of St. Paul, and how the Christian Church half consciously, half unconsciously entered into the imperial policy. It is therefore more than probable that St. Paul saw a definite analogy between the Church and the empire, and that the picture of the ideal Church drawn in the Epistle to the Ephesians, while he was himself a prisoner in Rome, was partly framed upon the ideal of the empire. That empire had originated in one small Italian city which had triumphed over its enemies, which had extended itself throughout the world, which had broken down all barriers of nationality, which had admitted aliens and foreigners to be fellow-citizens, and all this was summed up in its one head, the Emperor, the object of worship, the security for peace among the nations; while yet there still were enemies on the north and the east, against whom the empire had to be protected and the soldiers kept well armed for its defence. In

the same way the Christian Church had its origin in one small race, chosen out before the foundation of the world for God's work. In the fulness of time it had found its one Head; it was summed up in the Messiah, the one Lord, our Peace, who had broken down the barrier of Jewish distinction and made both Jew and Gentile one in their union with Him. Those who had been strangers and sojourners had been made fellow-citizens with the saints; those who had been estranged from the commonwealth of Israel were made its members. The kingdom was the kingdom of the Messiah as well as of God. Yet still there was conflict in store—the principalities, the powers, the rulers of the darkness of this world, the spiritual battalions of wickedness in high places were threatening His work, and the Christian must stand as a soldier armed with the panoply of God.

It is not quite so clear in which direction this analogy points with regard to our present point. There was an element of alliance

and federation in the process of the growth of the empire; but that is not the main aspect which it would present to a provincial of St. Paul's time. It was rather a unity of conquest than of alliance; it was a unity of privilege granted freely to new comers by the central body.

3. But the Epistle to the Ephesians supplies us with another theory of the origin of the Church's unity which is more convincing. It has been called the most "churchly" of the Epistles, and it is admitted on all hands that the word "the Church" is used here, not of any local congregation, but of the Church universal, which included both Jew and Gentile, by whose history the manifold wisdom of God is to be made known to the universe.

Now this clearly-marked conception of the Church, which is certainly more explicit than elsewhere in St. Paul, arises out of his meditations upon the nature of Christ and His relation to God the Father. In the Epistle to the Colossians he had dwelt on

Christ as the image of God, the Firstborn of all creation, the Mediator of life, the Upholder of the universe; so in the Epistle to the Ephesians the one God and Father of all is the keynote. He has had one continuous purpose running through the whole of history, to sum up all things both in heaven and in earth in the Messiah; for the Messiah is His complete representative on earth, and this Messiah has been given as Head to the Church; hence there is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one Body as well as one Spirit. Christians have to guard jealously the unity of the Spirit, and under His action the Church becomes in its turn the complete representative of the Messiah upon earth. The unity of the Church is therefore a quality which comes to it with its very life-blood; the Body is one because the Head is one; the Bride one because the Bridegroom is one; the Church one because God is one. The Epistle is a triumphant assertion that the Lord's last prayer was being answered, "That they all may be one;

as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be in Us: that the world may believe that Thou didst send Me. And the glory which Thou hast given Me I have given unto them; that they may be one, even as We are one."*

4. The historical relations of the Jewish with the Gentile Christians confirm the same conclusion. The chief problem of the first Christian century lay in the reconciliation of the claims of these two classes; but the fact that Gentile Christians had any claim at all in a body that was entirely Jewish rests upon the universal scope of the Lord's teaching and work. The Gentile Christians are not a great external body which federates itself with the Jewish Christian Church, but the Jewish Christian Church gradually draws within its own circle the Gentiles, because its teachers were convinced that Christ was Lord of all and that He was no respecter of persons. But when this principle had

* St. John xvii. 21, 22.

been perceived and acted upon there remained many open questions of the mutual relations of the two sets of Christians, and it is in his treatment of these that we shall recognise St. Paul's statesmanship.

Before his conversion the Church had admitted within its pale the Samaritans, an Ethiopian eunuch, and a Roman centurion, and thus the Jewish barrier of race had been broken down. In St. Paul's first missionary journey, if not before, the principle was carried to its logical conclusion, and Gentile idolaters were also admitted. But many questions remained to be answered.

(i.) Were these Gentile Christians to be circumcised, to pass through the Mosaic law into the Christian Church? This was answered in the conference at Jerusalem, where St. Paul appeared as the champion of the Gentile freedom, and the decision was arrived at that the Mosaic law as such was not to be binding on the Gentiles, though they were required to observe certain regulations of it, the violation of which

would have given offence to their Jewish brothers.

(ii.) But, again, were the Gentile Christians who were not observing the Jewish law to be placed on the same level, to be treated as the religious equals of the Jewish Christians who were observing it? Was it right for the two classes to eat together, to join in the common love-feast? This was the question answered in the discussion between St. Peter and St. Paul at Antioch; and again St. Paul is the champion of the Gentile freedom: on the ground that all alike were sinners, that Christ's redemption was universal, the principle of caste was banished from the Christian brotherhood.

(iii.) But, once more, were the Jewish Christians to go on observing the Jewish law? were they to circumcise *their* children and observe the Jewish festivals? To this St. Paul's answer is not quite clear, but at least it is certain that he tolerated such observance by Jewish Christians, and that he was willing to conform to it himself.

For when, on his last visit to Jerusalem, he was told that his enemies charged him with having taught the Jews who were scattered throughout the Gentile world that they ought not to circumcise their children nor observe the Jewish customs, his answer was a willing conformance to a Jewish rite. To Jews he became as a Jew. The further question still, whether Jewish Christians were for ever to continue observing these customs, was not solved by him; time brought its solution by the destruction of the Jewish temple and city, and by the preponderatingly Gentile extension of the Christian Church.

Now, when St. Paul started on his third missionary journey, the principle of Gentile freedom had long been conceded at Jerusalem; but it was not heartily recognised throughout the world, nor were the corollaries of it accepted. There was conflict in most of the Churches; there were the two sets of Christians, each sensitive, suspicious, critical of the position of the

other, and St. Paul's treatment of the situation is full of interest.

He first tries to create a sense of mutual dependence and obligation. The letters written during this journey enforce the collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem. The Gentile Churches in Achaia, Macedonia, Galatia are pressed to lay by week by week a contribution for the purpose; they elect their representatives to carry it to Jerusalem. When Corinth flags in the work, Titus is sent to rekindle its zeal; the contribution is large, and St. Paul decides to go with them to convey it.

The reasons for this stress upon the collection are most fully explained by St. Paul himself in 2 Cor. viii. and ix. It was a natural expression of Christian charity, like the money which the Church of Antioch had previously sent to the Church of Jerusalem in the time of the famine there. It was also a proof to the Jewish Churches of his own loyalty to the terms on which the leading apostles had acknowledged the work of him-

self and St. Barnabas, and had given them the right hands of fellowship. Only they would that we should remember the poor, which, for this very reason also,* as well as because of the instincts of Christian charity, I was also zealous to do" (Gal. ii. 10). The collection was undertaken for the glory of God, and to show the readiness, the zeal, of St. Paul and his companions (2 Cor. viii. 19).

But deeper still was the desire to create the sense of mutual obligation. The Jewish Churches had ministered their spiritual stores to the Gentiles; the latter were in their debt and ought to repay in such kind as they had, in earthly material help; then, in turn, he trusted that the Jewish Churches would be convinced of the reality of the Gentile Christianity; they would thank God for this proof of their subordination to the work of the gospel of the Messiah, and they would intercede with God for the Gentiles, and long for closer intercourse with them. The result

* καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο: probably, as suggested by Hort (*Jud. Christianity*, p. 67), this is the adverbial accusative. *Cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 3 καὶ ἔγραψα τοῦτο αὐτό, ἵνα μὴ ἐλθὼν λύπην σχῶ

would be an outburst of gratitude to God and of mutual intercession (2 Cor. ix. 12–14).

St. Paul was therefore most anxious both that the Gentiles should contribute with open-handed liberality, and that the saints in Jerusalem should receive the gift with warm-hearted gratitude. He even asked for the prayers of the Roman Christians to secure this result (Rom. xv. 31). It was at the time of this anxiety—when he was longing for this proof of the unity of the whole Church—that he wrote the Epistle to the Romans, the most universal of all his Epistles; and it was after the anxiety had been dispersed, after the gift had been accepted at Jerusalem, that he wrote the other universal Epistle, that to the Ephesians. The one is written to the centre of the Gentile world, the other to a group of Gentile Churches in and around Ephesus. Both are full of the thought of conciliation, of drawing Jew and Gentile together, but the one dwells more on universal need (πᾶς), the other on ultimate unity (εἷς, ἑνότης).

The Epistle to the Romans dwells on the universality of sin and the universality of salvation; all alike have fallen short of the glory of God, and salvation is offered to all, whether Jew or Gentile; hence, great as were the Jewish privileges in the past, all were now equal objects of God's grace; neither might the Jew despise the Gentile, nor the Gentile the Jew; each must bear with the other, for the Messiah had received them all. It is an attempt to produce brotherly feeling by the sense of dependence upon a common Father and a common Redeemer.

The Epistle to the Ephesians is written in a brighter tone, but the line of treatment is the same; it is not an argument, but a grateful recognition of a fact. Its tone is, "Thank God, Jew and Gentile alike, though both have been sinners, have both been forgiven by God in His Son, and therefore are united in one Body, the Church; and their main duty is to preserve the holiness and the unity thus granted to them." In

writing the Epistle to the Romans St. Paul had detected a new danger in the Christian Church: the Gentiles who had once been the despised might become the despisers;* the engrafted wild olive might boast itself against the natural branches; the new privilege granted to the Gentiles might be misused, as the old privilege of the Jews had been, and might be turned into a source of self-satisfiedness and forgetfulness of the sense of dependence upon God. Now this danger would naturally be greater in the Asiatic Churches, and the warning is perhaps rather clearer in the letter to them. St. Paul dwells on the continuity of God's plan; it has been thought out before the foundation of the world, it was centred in the commonwealth of Israel, it was summed up in the Jewish Messiah, it spiritualised the promises given to the Jews; hence the Gentiles must remember that they

* *Cf.* St. Jerome's comment, quoted by Swete, on St. Mark vii. 28, "*O mira rerum conversio! Israel quondam filius, nos canes.*"

were once estranged, that it was an act of God's grace by which they had been brought into the one body, and they must be on their guard against all vices which would destroy unity. St. Paul appears here as the champion of the despised Jew against the despising Gentile. As we look at his whole work we see that he is not merely the advocate of Gentile freedom; he is rather the advocate of Christian brotherhood. His interests are not limited to the salvation of individuals, nor to the rights of a party; he has a clear ideal conception of an universal kingdom, of a Catholic Church, of one new humanity, and he tries to uphold it in practice by becoming the champion of any section of humanity whose rights were imperilled, by binding together both sections by the sense of mutual indebtedness and by acts of mutual kindness, and, above all, by checking all pride and conceit and scorn by the sense of universal sinfulness, of indebtedness to a common Saviour, of dependence for their very life upon the one

Father, from whom every family, whether in heaven or in earth, is named.

It will be an interesting supplement to this argument if we trace St. Paul's use of the word ἐκκλησία, and his teaching in the different groups of his Epistles about the relation of each separate congregation to the other congregations. We shall find a variety of usage and a certain growth towards a more explicit conception of the catholic unity of the whole, but it would be a mistake to overpress the idea of growth, or to expect the later idea to appear only in the later Epistles or to supplant the earlier. The variety of usage depends on the particular context in each letter and the needs of the particular Church, as much as on a changing conception in the writer's mind.

In the earliest Epistles, those to the Thessalonians, St. Paul is only concerned with the local needs of Thessalonica; hence the word ἐκκλησία occurs only in the sense of a separate congregation. Thus the letters

are addressed to "the Church of the Thessalonians"—a phrase implying a separate congregation without any reference to other Christians (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1); but within this congregation there is to be brotherly love, peace, due discipline and subordination. Moreover, there are two references to other Churches. "We boast about you in the Churches of God" (2 Thess. i. 4), and more fully, "Ye became followers of the Churches of God which are in Judæa, for ye also have suffered like things" (1 Thess. ii. 14)—a slightly stronger phrase—not simply "the Churches of Jewish Christians," nor "the Churches of Judæa," but *the Churches of God* in Judæa; they have all one common association with God, and have a common link in this respect; and they have had the same experience as the Church of the Thessalonians. The first point of unity, then, is sympathy in suffering.

In the Epistle to the Galatians the word occurs in the salutation "the Churches of Galatia" (i. 2). These form one group of

Churches, joined by a common danger, and needing a common warning. There is no reference to their relation to other Churches; but there is great stress laid on the essential principle of the unity of all Christians, whether Jew or Gentile, as being sons of the Father in union with Christ Jesus, the true Son.

In the same way reference is made to the "Churches of Judæa which are in Christ" as a common group (i. 22); and St. Paul says that he persecuted "*the Church of God*," a phrase which recurs 1 Cor. xv. 9 and Phil. iii. 6 ("*the Church*"), and which seems to bear the full meaning of the one general body of Christians. Dr. Hort explains it as meaning "the original Ecclesia of Jerusalem or Judæa at a time when there was no other";* but there were also disciples at Damascus by this time, and St. Paul must include his persecution of them.

The Epistles to Corinth supply more material for our purpose. The title is

* *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 116.

different; not "the Church of the Corinthians," but "the Church of God which is in Corinth," as though a larger body had its local representative in Corinth. Very great stress is laid on unity as the proper characteristic of this local body; there are to be no party leaders, no divisions or heresies, no disorder in their meetings, but a due subordination and a spirit of love is to reign and to decide all disputed questions. But, further, St. Paul does not treat them as a separate congregation, for the Word of God did not come forth from them or come to them alone; neither in doctrine nor in custom are they to strike out a line independent of the other Churches. The salutation is addressed to them *with all that call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place, their Lord and ours* (i. 2). St. Paul sends Timothy to "put you in remembrance of my ways, which be in Christ, even *as I teach everywhere in every Church*" (iv. 17); he enforces his teaching about the effect of conversion on the married

state with the universal statement, "And so ordain I *in all the Churches*" (ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις πάσαις, vii. 17). Again, "We have no such custom, *neither the Churches of God*" (xi. 16), and "*as in all the Churches of the saints*" (xiv. 33).

Further, "the Churches of Galatia" (xvi. 1) and "the Churches of Asia" (xvi. 19) are spoken of as forming separate groups; and the phrase "the Church" (xii. 28), "the Church of God" (x. 32; xi. 22), seems wider than the mere congregation; it at least implies "the one universal Ecclesia as represented in the local individual Ecclesia."*

The second point of unity is, then, a growing conformity of doctrine and of custom.

In the second Epistle St. Paul applies the same title to the Church (i. 1); he groups together "the Churches of Macedonia" as one whole (viii. 1, *cf.* 19, 24),

* HORT, *ib.*, p. 117

and he speaks of "the brother whose praise in the gospel is spread through all the Churches" (διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, viii. 18), a phrase which is perhaps to be limited by the context to all the Churches of Macedonia, though there is no necessary reason for so limiting it. But apart from the usage of the word the Epistle adds two main contributions to the thought of unity; on the one hand, the principle of mutual charity is insisted upon—the Jews have helped the Gentiles and therefore the Gentiles are bound to help the Jews, and link the various Churches in the bond of charity; on the other hand, the Epistle shows the germs of the principle of jurisdiction. St. Paul is extremely anxious to respect the limits of the work of other preachers, and resents their interference with his own province (x. 12–16).

The Epistle to the Romans supplies very little to our present inquiry, because St. Paul is mainly dealing with the underlying principle of all unity, the universality of sinful-

ness and the universality of redemption. He dwells upon unity, but not upon the unity of Church with Church, but on the deeper unity, which needed first to be realised, of all redeemed humanity. But in the 16th chapter, which possibly may be of a rather later date, the word ἐκκλησία occurs frequently and in more varying sense than usual; it is used of the body of Christians assembling in one house (xvi. 5, *cf.* Col. iv. 15; Philemon 2), and of the congregation in Cenchreæ (xvi. 1); and we have two unique phrases, "all the Churches of the Gentiles," treated as sharing one common feeling of gratitude to Aquila and Priscilla (xvi. 4); and "all the Churches of the Messiah" (αἱ ἐκκλησίαι πᾶσαι τοῦ χριστοῦ xvi. 16) send greeting to the Romans. This last phrase must apparently be limited in some way; either it may mean "all the Christian congregations in this neighbourhood," or, possibly, the stress is on the Messiah, so that the reference is to the Churches of Judæa who first accepted the Messiah;

the Churches of the Jewish Christians, of whom, as concerning the flesh, the Messiah came. This is the view taken by Dr. Hort,* but he finds it hard to suggest a reasonable explanation of the fact that the Churches of Judæa should be sending a greeting to Rome through St. Paul at Corinth.

In the third group of the Epistles that to the Ephesians makes the fullest contribution. In this the Ecclesia is confessedly the one universal Church, the one body of which Christ is the one Head, and the ministers of which are His gifts, intended to bring all to a complete unity of the faith. The word is used in this sense and in this only (Eph. i. 22; iv. 20, 21; v. 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32).

In the Epistle to the Colossians the absolute use of the word appears twice (Col. i. 18, 24), but it is used also of a congregation in a private house (iv. 15) and of the local Church of the Laodiceans (iv. 16). This last verse points to a new bond which was arising; the Churches of Colossæ and Laodicea are

* *ib.*, p. 111. *Rom. and Eph.*, p. 52.

requested to exchange the letters addressed to them; this is the germ of a common Christian literature, the first step to the formation of a canon.

The Epistle to Philemon, not unnaturally, uses the word only of the congregation meeting in Philemon's house.

The Epistle to the Philippians is also very personal and adds little, but it lays great stress on the need of unity and mutual forbearance both at Rome and at Philippi; it uses the word ἐκκλησία of a local Church (iv. 15) and with the article, τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, apparently in the universal sense (iii. 6, *cf. supra* p. 59).

The Pastoral Epistles are primarily local; they do not lay down rules dealing with the relation of Church to Church, but only organise and insist upon the moral character of the ministry in the particular Churches of Ephesus and Crete. The word Church occurs only twice, each time strengthened with the title "*Church of God.*" In the first place the meaning is almost certainly that of

a local congregation. "If a man knoweth not how to rule his own house, how will he take care of the church of God?" (1 Tim. iii. 5).* The second case is more ambiguous; it is generally explained of the universal Church, "that thou mayest know how men ought to behave themselves in the house (family) of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth" ("a pillar and stay of the truth," HORT)† (iii. 15); but the analogy of the previous usage in the same chapter is in favour of the narrower view, that St. Paul is only directing the true behaviour of men in any family of God, for each such community is *a* Church of a God of life, and serves to sustain and to strengthen the truth. These words are doubtless true in a deeper manner of the whole Church; but it is a strengthening and bracing and humbling truth that each of us

* πῶς ἐκκλησίας Θεοῦ ἐπιμελήσεται; Both A.V. and R.V. translate "the Church of God," but there is no article, and the context requires that it should mean a particular church, not the universal church.

† HORT, pp. 172–174.

should realise that it was intended primarily to be true of each separate congregation entrusted to us.

Such then is the evidence which St. Paul's Epistles supply as to the unity of the Church: it comes from above, from the one Father; it is mediated from the one Word given to be its Head; it is the unity of the animating Spirit of God; it is analogous to the unity of the race of Israel or of the Roman Empire; but it embraces all races and gives them spiritual peace. On the other hand it is realised in experience from below, in a common sense of salvation from sin, in common suffering, in common doctrines and customs, in mutual deeds of charity, in respect for the work of others, in a common literature and a common spirit of toleration, subordination, forbearance, and love.

## III.

# THE ETHICAL TEACHER

### JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH

THE previous lectures have dwelt almost exclusively upon St. Paul's contribution to the corporate work of the Church; but the doctrine most frequently associated with his name is one which deals with the individual life, the doctrine of Justification by Faith. This doctrine stands in no antithesis to stress upon the truth of membership in the body of Christ, if it be held in its right position and proportion, and the object of this lecture will be to consider what meaning St. Paul attached to it, and why he laid such stress upon it.

St. Paul's historical position in the Chris-

tian Church and the difference of it from that of all the other Apostles is important as our starting-point. They had all had personal intercourse with the Lord, and when He was gone He necessarily lived in their hearts, if only through the power of memory. But it is almost certain that St. Paul had never seen Him; certainly He had been no follower of His; certainly, too, the Gentiles to whom he preached and the Gentile converts to whom he wrote his Epistles had never seen Him. He had, therefore, to face the problem, which was to be the problem to all future ages,—what could the absent Christ (if we may use the phrase without irreverence) be to those who had never seen Him on earth? His answer to the question was that the Invisible, the Risen, the Heavenly Christ, could do and be for men now all that He had done and been for those who had seen His life on earth. He was still a living Personal Power, still the source of healing, righteousness, and life to all who would trust Him;

that is the truth of which the doctrine of justification by faith is the theological expression.

When He was on earth He had moved among men as a physician with healing power, as a teacher who had come from God with words of eternal life, as the Way, the Truth, and the Life. But none of those forces acted in a magical way; there was always the approach of faith, whether the faith of the individual or of his friends; there was, at least, an instinctive sense of need and reaching out of a hand for help; there was the self-committal of the disciples to His cause; and then, as a response, there followed on His part the gift of bodily healing, the lifting up of the spiritual life, the fuller revelation of Truth, the sense of Sonship. "Thy faith hath saved thee" is the historical formula for that for which "justification by faith" is the dogmatic.* St. Paul's

* *Cf.* St. Mark v. 30, ὁ Ιησοῦς ἐπιγνοὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐξελθοῦσαν, with 34, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε, and vi. 5, 6.

doctrine was the assertion that Christ was still alive, still "the righteous One," still the Inspirer of righteousness in others, but that these gifts still came in no magical way; man must listen, must accept, must trust; and if he did, Christ would heal and justify him. So it had proved in his own case, and if in the case of himself, the chief of sinners, to whose case could it fail to apply? That was the mainspring of his whole missionary work, and his achievement is summed up by St. Clement in the striking epitaph, "He taught the whole world righteousness."*

A closer examination of each separate word of the formula will make the meaning clearer.

*Justification* is an act on God's part; it is the essential starting-point of the Christian life; it is the initial movement by which God puts man into a right relation with Himself. But it is not agreed what exactly

* "δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον."
CLEM. ROM. i. 5.

is implied in this, whether it should properly be regarded as a thought or an action on the part of God. Most commentators explain the word δικαιοῦν as meaning to *regard* as righteous, to think of as righteous; justification is with them a loving thought within the mind and heart of God, so that when He is said to justify the ungodly it means that He thinks of ungodly people as containing within themselves the possibilities of becoming righteous. Others again would translate the word to *make* righteous, so that justification is an action, and God justifies the ungodly when He gives them righteousness, when He commences the actual process which changes their lives. The truth perhaps lies between the two views and embodies somewhat of both; doubtless the starting-point lies in the heart of God, in the forgiving love of a Father always regarding His wayward children as capable of change, always thinking of the ungodly as potentially righteous; but this thought is not conceived

of as an otiose thought in the mind of God in the way in which a speculative theologian might meditate on His attributes, but as a thought already interpreting itself into action, going out in acts of loving treatment. If we may apply it to the parable of the prodigal son, the love of the father and his hope of the return of the prodigal were always there, attracting, drawing, "preventing," but it was scarcely justifying love till it welcomed him on his return, and brought him back into the home: then he was once more in the right relation of son to father. "To justify" is therefore not exactly to *regard* as righteous or to *make* righteous, but to *treat* as righteous.

In a somewhat similar way *faith* combines two elements, an intellectual and a moral; it unites the connotation of the English words *belief* and *trust*.

It is partly the intellectual assent to a message given, but it is not merely a rational deduction from definite premises, it is rather a spiritual sight which pierces through the external to the internal reality that lies

behind it. It was defined by Professor Henry Drummond as "the clairvoyant power of seeing the eternal in the temporal." * Thus the external temporal facts were that Jesus of Nazareth was a good Jew, who had been unjustly crucified, and who had, according to the witness of His followers, risen again. These may be treated by the reason as bare historic facts ending in themselves, but faith interprets them into eternal realities; it believes the statement made by the Lord Himself, that He came from God, and that His death has an universal significance, that His resurrection also implied that He was still a living power and had a message of life for others. Christian faith is, then, the belief in the possibility of sinners being forgiven, and of rising to new life through the mediation of the Lord.

But perhaps the more central thought in faith is that of trust—self-surrender. If our Lord's first demand was, "Believe in the

* *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, p. 11.

gospel" (St. Mark i. 15), His fuller demand was, "Believe in Me" (St. John xiv. 1). This was the faith of His first followers; it was the antithesis to timidity, to cowardice (*cf.* St. Mark iv. 40, Τί δειλοί ἐστε; οὔπω ἔχετε πίστιν;); they left all and followed the new Teacher, who appealed to their deepest needs and demanded their allegiance; they trusted Him although they knew not whither He would lead them, and understood not much of His teaching. This trustful surrender remains still of the essence of the Christian's faith, which is the response of the central personality in a man to the demands which a higher personality makes upon it. It has been defined as "the absolute surrender of self to a Being who has the right to command that surrender"; * or, again, "Faith is not merely assent or adhesion, but enthusiastic adhesion, personal adhesion"; † or better still, as combining both aspects, "Faith is at once a vision and an alle-

* Bishop LIGHTFOOT, Colossians (ed. 1875), p. 187.

† SANDAY and HEADLAM on Romans i. 17.

giance." * The doctrine of justification by faith is, then, the assurance that God is willing to treat as righteous anyone who welcomes the possibilities of a new spiritual life offered through Christ, and who is willing to accept Christ as the guide of his life.

This helps to meet the difficulty which is often urged, that it is immoral and unreal to say that a sinful man can be treated as though he were righteous, for, on the hypothesis of faith, a change has already taken place, and a change in the very centre of the man's personality; the centre is no longer self but Christ.

It is quite true that the man is not yet righteous, that after years of growing righteousness and sanctification he will count himself far from the goal, but he is on the right path, his face is set in the right direction, his will has turned itself to the light. As in a new-born babe there lie latent all the faculties of the grown man or woman, and we have prescience enough to

* Dr. HORT, *Hulsean Lectures*, p. 114.

anticipate their development, so God's omniscience sees the latent faculties of the changing heart, and welcomes and fosters them.

"God," it has been said, "justifies by anticipation";* or, again, "God sees and accepts the changed heart before the change has manifested itself in the life";† or, once more, "God loves us, not as we are through our own merits, but as we are destined to become through His own gift."‡

A poet has described the secret moment when new life stirs within the earth at spring-tide, and which, though no man sees it, carries with it all the rich bloom of summer:—

> "There is a day in spring
> When under all the earth the secret germs
> Begin to glow and stir *before they bud.*
> The wealth and festal pomps of mid-summer
> Lie in the heart of that inglorious day
> Which no man names with blessing, though its worth
> Is blest of all the world."

* Canon GORE, *Bampton Lectures*, viii., p. 225.

† RENDALL, *Theology of the Hebrew Christians*, p. 34.

‡ The Second Council of Orange, Can. xii. Tales nos amat Deus quales futuri sumus ipsius dono, non quales sumus nostro merito. *Cf.* ST. AUGUSTINE, *de Trin.*, I, x. 21.

That is a symbol of all that lies in the first movement of new life in the soul; no man may know or name it, but God knows and names it with the name of Christ.

Again, there is no unreality in this justification because the "imputation" of righteousness tends of itself to impart righteousness. To treat a man as being potentially better than he has yet shown himself to be is to make him better. We all know by experience what it is to be with one who by his inspiring hopefulness and belief in us draws out powers of love or intelligence which we had scarcely suspected ourselves. "The people who influence you are people who believe in you. In an atmosphere of suspicion men shrivel up, but in that atmosphere they expand and find encouragement and educative fellowship. . . . To be trusted is to be saved. And if we try to influence or to elevate others we shall soon see that success is in proportion to their belief of our belief in them, for the respect of another is the first restoration of the self-

respect a man has lost; our ideal of what he is becomes to him the hope or pattern of what he may become."* "In setting before the mind a lofty ideal," it has been recently said of a great teacher, "he implied a belief in powers hereafter to be developed, and the belief seemed to create the thing believed in. But the intellectual stimulus was not all. He seemed to divine one's spiritual needs, and by mere contact and the brightness of his presence to supply them."† In the same spirit Seneca, after rebuking Lucilius for calling a man his friend, though he would not entrust him with his secrets, gave the far-reaching advice, "Treat a man as trustworthy and you will make him trustworthy."‡ So was it when our Lord was on earth; the publican and sinner found that He believed in their power of goodness; He called them to follow Him in the service of God,

* Prof. H. DRUMMOND, *The Greatest Thing in the World*, p. 37.

† *Life and Letters of B. Jowett*, vol. i. p. 200.

‡ SENECA, *Ep. Mor.*, i. 3, "*Fidelem si putaveris, facies.*"

and in the power of His belief in them they believed in Him; and as He said nothing save what He had heard from His Father, the doctrine of justification by faith is the assurance of the Father's unquenchable faith in His children.

Further, it needs to be remembered that the sinner who puts faith in Christ is not left alone; other forces than his own at once become operative within him. He is "in Christ"; he is united by Baptism with the body of Christ, the Church; and as a branch that is grafted into a tree draws a strength not its own from the sap of the tree, so he shares in the life of Christ and of the Christian body; he is regarded both by God and man as part of the whole to which he now belongs. He is credited with its inherent qualities.

This principle of imputation whereby the qualities of the whole are imputed to the part is universal in life: it is the regular way by which we make our first approach to knowledge and intercourse with others. You

meet a stranger in some desert, you know absolutely nothing of him, but you recognise that he is a man, and you credit him at once with the simple instincts which belong to the human race. You speak, and he proves to be an Englishman; at once you attribute fresh qualities to him, you trust him more, you feel drawn in a closer bond to him, though as yet there is little to justify such confidence. You watch him and see a likeness to one you love and admire; again you are drawn closer to him, you credit him with the qualities which have stirred your love and admiration in others. You get deeper into conversation and he proves to be a Christian; once more you credit him with higher qualities and are drawn into closer friendship with him. At each stage you have been imputing to him qualities which you do not yet know to belong to him, drawn from the circle to which he belongs. It is true that he must justify your trust and really be proved in the end to have these qualities in himself, but

that is equally true in the religious sphere. God sees each individual Christian in the light of Christ, to whom he belongs; that is the starting-point, but the man must in the end be proved righteous by his works.

The secret, then, of the true religious life is, according to St. Paul, faith. Everyone who trusts in the message which Christ brought of the possibility of his redemption, who owns allegiance to His guidance and unites himself to His followers, is on the right path; he is regarded by God as one with Christ, sharing in spiritual forces which make for righteousness; he is justified. It was for this doctrine, more than for any other, that St. Paul was forced to enter into controversy, and we shall appreciate the reasons why he laid so much stress upon it, if we see also what was the alternative view of justification, against which he contended. This view was that of the Jews and Judaising Christians, and may be presented in one of two ways.

(*a*) It laid stress on the mere position of privilege inherited by birth. The Jew held that he was right with God because he was a Jew, and that every Gentile must approximate to this position as closely as possible by submitting to circumcision. The stricter Rabbis held that the observance of the whole moral law, that prayer, penitence, almsgiving, would not benefit the heathen at all as long as they were not united to Judaism; and, on the other hand, that no Jew could go into Gehenna, that "father Abraham" could and would save every descendant of his.* God's election of the Jews for His task of being a blessing to all the nations was perverted into an absolute election without reference to task performed or life lived.

(*b*) The less narrow form of the view was that a man was right in the sight of God if he performed the whole moral law; it laid stress upon action, upon moral action,

* *Cf.* SANDAY and HEADLAM on Romans ii. 14; ix. 6. GORE, *Studia Biblica*, iii. pp. 37–45.

upon obedience; a man must in his own strength work out his own righteousness (*τὴν ἰδίαν δικαιοσύνην*, Phil. iii. 9) by obedience to law (*τὴν ἐκ νόμου δικαιοσύνην, ἰδ.*)

Against both of these views St. Paul set his face as an adamant. The objection to the first is obvious; it would limit the extension of the gospel, or at least it would perpetuate a system of caste within the Church; it laid stress upon a mere position of birth-privilege, and therefore was fatal to the demands of morality; it was inconsistent with the facts of sin, which were universal, and with the character of the Lord, who represented the whole human race.

The objections to the second view are equally fatal, though they do not lie so much upon the surface. Why should it not be sufficient to say that a man is right in God's sight if he obeys His commandments?

(i.) Because the simplest maxim of true morality insists that an act is insufficient by

itself, that the whole of its ethical value depends upon its motive.

Two acts of different men, which appear exactly identical to outward view, may prove to Him who sees the heart, the one the expression of willing obedience, the other of sullen unwillingness; the one the impulse of self-sacrificing love, the other the deliberate outcome of a calculated selfishness. To insist, then, on justification by works is to ignore the *motive*, whereas faith is a matter of heart that necessarily affects motive. It expresses the same truth as that summed up in the quaint saying of the Scotch Jesuit quoted by Hooker, that "God respects adverbs more than verbs"; it is not what we do, but why we do it, that justifies us, because, as Hooker adds, "the end of His law in appointing what we shall do is our own perfection, which perfection consisteth chiefly in the virtuous disposition of the mind, and approveth itself to Him, not by *doing*, but by doing *well*."*

* *Eccles. Polity*, v. 62, 15.

(ii.) Because faith lifts the motive to the highest level. As long as God is thought of primarily as a Law-giver or a Judge, obedience to His commands takes somewhat of the form of slavery: "I must," or "I ought," is the feeling with which we act. But the revelation of Christ was that God was always a Father training His sons to be like Him in holiness: to put faith in Christ was to believe in God's commandments as being the guidance of love along the path of perfection. The language of the true son rises above "I ought" into "I wish to," "I will."

(iii.) Yet deeper still, justification by works tends to lay stress on self; justification by faith throws it upon God. Man responds to an appeal. He enters into that which God has prepared for him. As at creation man entered into a world which he himself had not created, and faith accepted it as God's world, so in redemption the initiative had been on God's side. He had sent forth

His Son; the Son had revealed the Father's love. He had laid down His life of His own free will as a ransom for many. God had raised Him from the dead, and exalted Him at the right hand of God; He is now shedding forth His Spirit. Faith, then, accepted a Divine gift of new power, and this seemed to St. Paul to make all the difference between despair and hope. He had tried to build up his own righteousness and the result was summed up in the cry, "Who shall deliver me out of the body of this death" (Rom. vii. 24); he accepted the righteousness of Christ and the result was the triumphant note, "I can do all things in Him that strengtheneth me" (Phil. iv. 3). Faith in this sense is akin to the wise passiveness which Wordsworth recommends as a part of our attitude to the natural world, when he says:

> "Nor less I deem that there are powers
> Which of themselves our minds impress
> That we can feed this mind of ours
> In a wise passiveness.

"Think you, mid all this mighty sum
Of things for ever speaking,
That nothing of itself will come,
But we must still be seeking?"

So faith accepts the grace of God and its power passes into the human heart. It is the attitude of a heart that "watches and receives."

Justification by faith is thus the starting-point of the sinner's new life; but it is akin to the true attitude of the creature to the Creator, the feeling of creaturely dependence and acceptance of life freely offered, and it always remains the central attitude of the religious life. The Christian is placed in a right relation to God, and remains in that right relation by the sense of trustful dependence. But the starting-point is not the goal, and the centre is not the circumference. There is still left room, or rather there is a clear necessity for all the processes of morality, of education, of sanctification, in order to develop the full-grown righteousness of the man.

This thought entirely reconciles the apparent contradiction between the language of St. Paul and that of St. James. At first sight they seem to contradict each other directly: "We reckon that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law" in St. Paul (Rom. iii. 28) stands over against the protest of St. James, "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith apart from works is barren?" "Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith" (ii. 22, 24). But the position of the two writers is different. St. James speaks in the spirit of a Jewish prophet, of the practical preacher, demanding a complete Christian sincerity, a reality that shall correspond with profession; his point of view is that of the final judgment, when faith has had time to be tested by results, and God passes His verdict upon the whole life, and justifies by retrospection. Hence the faith which St. James denounces is little more than the profession of belief; the works which he requires are active

deeds of charity and control of the whole body. His assertion that "faith without works is barren" is the counterpart of St. Paul's protest against knowledge, "Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth" (1 Cor. viii. 2). St. Paul would accept every word of St. James; he writes as a theologian, trying to formulate the principles on which the Christian life and the Christian Church were to be built up; he gets behind the position of St. James that faith and works must go together, and emphasises the truth that, of these two, faith is the root and works the fruit, and that therefore faith is the more fundamental.

It remains only to notice that St. Paul in contending for this principle was really upholding the main teaching of the prophets of the Old Testament, as against the degraded and popularised conception of the Jewish position in the later rabbinical theology. So far from claiming to announce a new religious principle in this respect, he insists that the faith of Abraham

was analogous to that of the Christian; Abraham believed in a God "who quickeneth the dead," *i.e.*, as it appeared to Abraham—who was able to quicken the deadness of Sarah's womb and cause the birth of Isaac; and, perhaps also, who was able to give back Isaac from death (*cf.* Heb. xi. 19). So Christians believe in a God "who quickeneth the dead," *i.e.*, who had raised Christ from the dead. Abraham believed in a God "who calleth the things that are not as though they were" (Rom. iv. 17), that is to say, a God who had originally created the world out of nothing, or more probably, a God who told him of a seed that should be as the sand of the sea for multitude when as yet he had no child; and the Christian believed in a God who was summoning a great Gentile Church into existence, and foreseeing in souls dead in sins and trespasses a righteousness which was not but which should be. St. Paul almost overstrains the analogy of details, so sure is he of the identity of principle;

and later, when he wishes to express the true language of faith, he expresses it in words borrowed from Deuteronomy, "But the righteousness of faith saith not, who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down): or, who shall descend into the abyss? (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead). But what saith it? the word is nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach" (Rom. x. 6–8; Deut. xxx. 11–14). There is, too, a constant note of warning to the Jews throughout the whole Old Testament against trust in their position of privilege and forgetfulness of God. "Not unto us, not unto us, O Lord, but to Thy name give the glory" (Psalm cxv. 1; *cf.* xliv. 1–9) is the prayer of the true Israelite, and the prophetic warning was, "Beware lest thou forget the Lord thy God, in not keeping His commandments, His judgments, and His statutes, . . . lest when thou hast eaten and art full, and hast built goodly houses, and dwelt therein, . . . then thy

heart be lifted up, and thou forget the Lord thy God, . . . and thou say in thine heart, My power and the might of my hand hath gotten me this wealth."* Such a warning is of a piece with the Lord's parable against those who trusted in themselves that they were righteous (St. Luke xviii. 9), and such trust is the exact antithesis of St. Paul's doctrine of justification by faith.

* Deut. viii. 17.

# IV.

# THE ETHICAL TEACHER

## THE MORAL LAW

THE examination of the meaning of justification by faith needs to be supplemented by an examination of St. Paul's teaching of the binding force of law upon the Christian's conscience; and here we are at once met by an apparent contradiction in St. Paul's own language, for, whereas he declares that "Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness to everyone that believeth" (*τέλος νόμου*, Rom. x. 4), yet he indignantly repudiates the charge that Christians make the law of none effect through faith. "God forbid," he cries;

"nay, we establish 'the law,' or, rather, 'law'; we set law, the whole conception of law as such, on a stronger basis" (*νόμον ἱστάνομεν*, Rom. iii. 31).

These two antithetical statements occur, however, in the same letter; each was written within a few hours of the other; they must be reconcilable, and the reconciliation seems to lie in the fact that Christ had displaced the law from a position which it had usurped and placed it in its right position.

The law had held the central position in the religious life of a Jew; it had been the main motive for right action. Had you asked a Roman or a Greek "Why must I do what I know to be right?" the answer would have been, "Because the state commands it." Had you asked a Jew the same question, the answer would have been, "Because the law commands it"; but the Christian answer is, "Because Christ has redeemed me; He has revealed the Father's love to me, and given me of His Spirit, and

therefore I wish to do the Father's will." The centre of morality has been shifted; it has become the direct relation to a Person. But this has made law more binding and more willingly obeyed; it has placed it on a firmer basis as the revelation of a Father's love; it has revealed

> "A gentleness behind the law,
> A sweetness following on the awe."*

The Christian is no longer under law as a slave; he is the ally, the friend of law.†

A simple human analogy may be used to illustrate this change, for somewhat of a similar change occurs at the time of marriage. To one who marries the centre of human life and human duty shifts. Hitherto the centre has been the parents' home; obedi-

* S. PHILLIPS, *Poems*, p. 48, "Faith."

† *Cf.* ST. AUGUSTINE on St. John i., Tr. 3, "*Qui legem implet non est sub lege sed cum lege.*"

AMBROSIASTER on Rom. ii. 12, "*Qui non peccat, amicus legis est.*"

ence to the parents, love of the parents, has been the guiding and controlling power over the child. "Honour thy father and thy mother" has been the first commandment among these that touch our duty to our neighbour. But marriage introduces a new centre; duty to and love for the husband or wife become the main motives of action, for "a man shall leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife." The command, "Honour thy father and thy mother," is not cancelled, indeed, but it has to be reconciled with the other command, "Hearken, O daughter, and consider, and incline thine ear; forget also thine own people, and thy father's house" (Ps. xlv. 10).

A new centre, self-chosen, springing out of the deepest instincts of a personality seeking its own fullest completion, has displaced the old, which had been inherited and was not the object of personal choice. But does it follow from this that the love of our parents is diminished, or the duty

of honouring them abolished? Surely, in so far as any marriage is an ideal marriage, the very reverse is the case. The son or daughter reaching the fulness of their own life knows even better than before the debt which they owe to the parents who made that life possible; if children are born to the marriage the growing sense of father-hood or motherhood enables them to enter more into their parents' heart, to understand more of their sacrifice and effort than they had known before; the quickening of their own power of love and of their gratitude reacts upon the love of parents. The new power of emotion drawn out by the stronger centre has intensified the whole range of emotion; so that the love of parents, though *relatively* less commanding in the position which it holds in life, is *absolutely* stronger than before. If marriage is the end of parental law and filial duty, none the less does it establish them on a firmer and deeper basis.

Somewhat similar is St. Paul's teaching

about the law. In its merely Jewish aspect it was destroyed altogether; it was no longer to be a privilege of the Jews, and therefore all those parts of it which separated Jews from Gentiles, and served that purpose only, were temporary and now fell away. But even with regard to the deeper and more essential commands, such as those of the Ten Commandments, a change took place. Christ ended the central position which law held in the relation of man to God. To insist upon it as a mere external rule to be obeyed, as an end rather than as a means, as a centre rather than as a line radiating from the centre, in one word as a rival to Christ, that was to fall away from grace; that was to remain as a child, when grown up; that was to stunt the full-growth of the Christian manhood. In all these senses Christ had put an end to law. But in proportion as Christ's Spirit reveals to us the real value of God's will and strengthens us to obey it, the natural instinct of love fulfils the law.

But such teaching can very easily be misrepresented, and clearly was misrepresented as dangerous to morality. St. James' protest against faith without works may very well be a protest against some such perversion of St. Paul's teaching; but his own Epistles bear witness to the same misrepresentation. He was accused of teaching "let us do evil that good may come,"—so he tells us, as he first approaches his statement about faith, in the opening of the Epistle to the Romans (iii. 8).

For the moment he contents himself with an indignant repudiation of the charge—it is a slanderous report; the condemnation of those who say it is just. But subsequently, in chapters vi. – viii., he deals with it more fully, and, while nominally answering objections, he really builds up by gradual stages a constructive theory of Christian ethics. Thus in answer to the first objection, "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" the first stone is laid, viz.,

that sin, which is lawlessness, is inconsistent with the starting-point of the Christian life; that Christian baptism implied death to a sinful past and resurrection to a newness of life (vi. 1–14).

But, again, if law is no longer our master, shall we sin afresh? Nay, Christianity has not left us free in the sense that we have no master, it has committed us to a fresh service; obedience is still our characteristic, and its aim is righteousness and holiness· we are like slaves transfered to a new master, or like a widow remarried to a second husband, with fresh obligations and a fresh devotion (vi. 15–vii. 6).

But if law has had to be displaced, does not that imply that it was a bad thing, that it was sin? Again he denies the inference, and here he does not say, as in the Epistle to the Galatians, that law was a good thing for a temporary purpose only; he goes deeper in writing to members of a nation whose pride was in law, and asserts that the com-

mandment was ordained to life, that "the law is holy and the commandment is holy and just and good." The fault lay not with the law, but with the weakness of human nature, and so he passes to the corner-stone of his theory; the gift of the Spirit to the Christian lifts him to the sense of sonship; the power of sin is broken by Christ's death; human nature can now subject itself to the law of God; the requirements of the law can be fulfilled; a freedom has been attained which can obey, which wills to work out the law of God, because it knows that in so doing it is working out its own highest development. The mercies of God have enabled men to present their bodies a living sacrifice to Him.

Such is St. Paul's theory of Christian morality; it starts with a break from sin, made possible by Christ's death and resurrection; it implies service, loyalty to a master, something analogous to the love of a wife for her husband; it is made possible

by the indwelling Spirit which produces freedom, and manifests itself by a loving fulfilment of law.*

But it is sometimes felt that while St. Paul lays great stress on Christian freedom in these chapters, he seems to undermine it in the following section by the emphasis which he lays upon God's predestination both for mercy and for judgment. "So then He hath mercy on whom He will, and whom He will He hardeneth" (ix. 18).

This objection is partly met by the consideration that St. Paul is there mainly dealing not with the choice of individuals for their own final salvation, but with the election of Israel for its task of being a

* It is interesting to compare the way in which St. Peter appeals to Christians to obey the Imperial Government in the spirit of "free" men (1 Peter ii. 13–16). "In submitting then to the institutions of human society, St. Peter means to say that Christians were not bowing their heads afresh to the old yoke, but were approaching them from a different point of view altogether, regarding them as *ordinances of God's own independent law, which it was their joy and pride to fulfil.*" (HORT, *ad loc.*)

chosen people. This is true, but it does not seem to me to exhaust the full meaning of his language; it is more fully met by remembering the theoretical position of those against whom he is arguing. He has just finished his statement of the universality of sin, and the universality of redemption, and of the offer of the Holy Spirit, when the objection naturally occurs to his mind, that so far from being universal it has been rejected by God's own people, the Jews; and the objection is put into their mouths. They are supposed to argue that the truthfulness and justice of God required that the salvation should be specially theirs. It was the old plea of privilege of birth; God's choice of the Jews was treated as binding Him absolutely without any reference to their faith.* It is against this that St. Paul urges the freedom of God; God cannot be bound down in this way; He is Sovereign; He

* *Cf. supra*, p. 83.

never promised His blessings to all Israel without conditions. He has offered this new salvation to them; it is their fault if they do not accept it. Now it is clear that this argument is an argument in favour of morality; it is a protest against a view which would fetter God's action in such a way that He could take no account of the true religious attitude of man. It is a plea for the Sovereignty of God, but for that of the God of the Old Testament, a God who was not arbitrary or capricious, but a Just and Holy God, merciful and long-suffering, and yet one who would not pardon the guilty.

But the point which I wish to illustrate more fully is the way in which St. Paul, in practical dealing with his converts, gradually brings all sides of the Christian's life under the control of regulation, discipline, law; and here it is possible to trace a growth in the teaching of the Epistles as time went on. We will notice in each group the sphere of human life which is

thus disciplined and the grounds on which the appeal is made.

In the Epistles to the Thessalonians St. Paul is dealing with one congregation, probably small, living in the midst of a large heathen city; and the appeal to them is to win the respect of their heathen neighbours (1 iv. 12) by a life which shall be different from theirs. They are not to follow the passion of lust "as the Gentiles, which know not God" (1 iv. 5); they are not to grieve "as the rest which have no hope" (iv. 13); they are not to sleep "as do the rest" (v. 6); but they are to live as those whom God has called "in sanctification" (iv. 7), as "sons of light and sons of the day" (v. 5). With this view their own personal life, and their relation to one another as members of a congregation, are regulated. They are to avoid all kinds of impurity, all idleness and disorder, and there is to be discipline, effectively exercised and loyally accepted, within the congregation; disobedience there

is not to be tolerated (1 v. 12–22; 2 iii. 6–15). The private personal life, and the order of the life of the community, are first brought under the control of law.

The second group of Epistles supplies us mainly with the theory of Christian morality; but it adds much also on the side of practice.

In the Epistle to the Galatians the appeal is made to the change which has passed over the Christians themselves; they are not to live such a life as they had lived, whether as Jews or Gentiles, in the past; they are not to live as minors under "guardians and stewards," but as grown-up men (iv. 2); they are not to live as slaves, but as sons (iv. 3–4); not as those who are under the law, but as those who are led by the Spirit (v. 18); not as they lived when they knew not God, but as men who have come to know God, or, rather, to be known of God (iv. 8). The range of vices as enumerated in the works of the flesh is wider; the fruit of the Spirit is extended

to feelings rather than to mere acts (v. 19–23); Christian beneficence is to be shown to all men, as well as to the household of faith (vi. 10); and for the first time, now that he has clearly marked the difference between law and spirit, St. Paul does not hesitate to transfer the very word law into the Christian region. "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ." "Through love be servants one to another, for the whole law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (v. 14; vi. 2).

The first Epistle to Corinth deals almost entirely with morality, but does not very widely enlarge the sphere to which it is applied, though it adds many details within the previous spheres. The appeal is essentially to a body which stands apart from the heathen world; they are consecrated in Christ Jesus; they are called to be saints (i. 2); they are chosen out of the world (i. 27); they are the temple of the Holy

Ghost (iii. 16); they are bought with a price (vi. 20; vii. 23); they will ultimately judge the world, hence they may not take their lawsuits before the unjust, but are to settle them in the Christian community itself (vi. 1–4). The whole of their intercourse with their heathen neighbours is regulated; the duty of married people to each other is enforced; the law of divorce is laid down; the order of the meetings of the congregation for worship is regulated even in such a minute detail as the dress of the women. Love as the spring of Christian morality is the principle assumed throughout.

The second Epistle is too personal and controversial to contribute anything to our present purpose, unless it be that the duty of mutual help between Church and Church is enforced; but it is pressed by St. Paul, not by way of command, but only as a hint of the direction in which Christian charity should exert itself (viii. 8).

We have spoken sufficiently of the theory of Christian morality so elaborately drawn out in the Epistle to the Romans, and of the assertion of the essential holiness of the law, but the practical directions of the later chapters are very important for our purpose.

Like previous Epistles they regulate the duty of personal purity, of mutual subordination and forbearance within the Christian community, but they also bring within the scope of a Christian's duty his life as a citizen. This too is natural in an Epistle sent to Rome, not only because it was the centre of the Imperial Government, but also because, as St. Paul would have learnt from Aquila and Priscilla, the Jews were constantly raising seditions against that Government, and might easily influence the Christians in the same direction. Obedience to the Government, in all matters of secular life, is therefore put under the strongest possible sanction. "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers . . .

the powers that be are ordained of God . . . ye must needs be in subjection, not only for wrath, but for conscience sake" (xiii. 5. *ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι, οὐ μόνον διὰ τὴν ὀργήν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν*). The Christian conscience is as peremptory as the Imperial magistrate.

In the third group of the Epistles the appeal is on the old lines, but it also takes a more mystical form; Christians are no longer to walk "as the Gentiles" (Eph. iv. 17), but "as becometh saints" (v. 3), as "members one of another" (iv. 25), as those who have died and risen with Christ and are no longer living in the world (Col. ii. 20), no longer dead in trespasses and sins (Eph. ii. 1), as no longer children of God's wrath, but children of His love (Eph. ii. 3; v. 1). The old virtues of personal purity, of brotherly love, are insisted upon; but further, for the first time, family life is regulated in all its relationships.

We have seen how the influence of the

Empire tended to raise the standard of marriage in contrast to the unbridled licence of Asiatic religions; yet St. Paul, as he passed to Rome and found how literally true was the picture of heathen life which he had sketched in his Epistle to the Romans, may well have felt more than ever that the family life of his Gentile converts must be placed on a sure basis of religious duty if the world was to be gained for Christ. It is at least certain that the only organisation of family life is found in letters written from Rome both by himself and by St. Peter, and it is interesting to compare the three paragraphs that deal with it. They deal with the relationship of husband and wife, of parent and child, of master and slave. The earliest, that in the Epistle to the Colossians (iii. 18–iv. 1), is the simplest; it regulates each relationship with one central command, and bases the sanction upon the new life "in the Lord." Possibly this teaching is meant to be a silent protest against the false ascet-

icism which was being taught at Colossæ, "Handle not, nor taste, nor touch" (ii. 20); so that St. Paul's motive here will be double. He wishes, first, to say that marriage is honourable, that it is one of the material relations which have been hallowed by the Lord's dwelling among men; but, secondly, that if this is so, the standard of family life must rise above that prevailing in heathenism.

The second, that in Ephesians (v. 22–vi. 9), is much fuller. The rules laid down are much the same; but the whole is dominated by the thought that the family is the training-ground for the virtues which are to find their full development and exercise in the Church. The section on family life is only a part of the wider appeal to the Gentile Christians to live worthy of their calling to be members of the Church, which is to be one body; and St. Paul sees that the qualities of subordination—love, obedience, justice—must be learnt first of all in the home. Thus wives are to be in subjection unto their own husbands, not, as in Col. iii. 18, "*as is fit in the Lord*,"

but as "*unto the Lord*," "*as the Church is subject to Christ*," and they are also bidden to *reverence* their husbands. Husbands are not only to love their wives and avoid bitterness, but to love them "*as Christ loved the Church*." Fathers are not only to avoid provoking and discouraging their children, but to bring them up "*in the nurture and admonition of the Lord*." The Christian family must be regulated, and if so, it will train its members in the qualities of true churchmanship.

The first Epistle of St. Peter is now generally regarded as being influenced in phrase and thought by the Epistle to the Ephesians, and its treatment of the family is in many respects the same; but the context in which it occurs gives it a new colouring. The whole epistle is an exhortation to the Gentile Christians of Asia Minor so to live that their lives may contradict the slanderous accounts of Christianity which were in circulation, and which became a pretext for persecution; and the true ob-

servance of family duties is impressed upon them as one means of appeal to the outside world, one method of contradicting heathen slanders and attracting heathens to the faith. Thus servants are to be "in subjection to their masters with all fear," not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward; for such endurance of wrongful suffering is like Christ's endurance, which had drawn themselves back to the Shepherd and Bishop of their souls. Wives are to be in subjection to their own husbands, that if any obey not the word *they may be gained by the behaviour of their wives.* Husbands are to dwell with their wives according to knowledge, "*to the end that your prayers be not hindered*" (ii. 18–iii. 7).

A beautiful description of such an effect is to be found in Mr. Pater's imaginary picture of the Epicurean attracted to Christianity by the sight of the perfect naturalness of the family life in a Christian home: "What he found was the vision of a natural, a scrupulously natural, love transforming by

some new *finesse* of insight into the truth of human relationships, and under the urgency of some new motive, by him so far unfathomable, all the conditions of life. . . . The nature of the family for which the better genius of Old Rome itself had so sincerely cared, of the family and its appropriate affections—all that love of one's kindred by which obviously one does triumph in some degree over death—had never been so felt before. Here surely, in its nest-like peace and warmth, its jealous exclusion of all that was against itself and its own immaculate naturalness, in the hedge set around the sacred thing on every side, this reinstitution of the family did but carry forward and give effect to the purposes, the kindness of nature itself, friendly to man at all those points, more especially, where it involved pity and a willing sacrifice of oneself for the weak, for children and the aged, for the dead even."*

* W. H. PATER, *Marius the Epicurean*, chap. xxii.

We return to St. Paul. The Pastoral Epistles form a natural climax in this connection, for their one peremptory aim is to insist on morality. The life of the ministry of the Church is brought under the regulation of moral rule; the bishop, the deacon, their wives, their families, the deaconess, the widows, must conform to definite rules of morality; but the rules are not limited to them; old men, old women, young men, young women, slaves are controlled; obedience to the Government is enforced (Titus ii. iii.). Family life, citizen life, Church life, ministerial life are brought under the reign of law; the essential characteristic of the Christian is that he should be orderly (κόσμιος), self-disciplined (σώφρων), and the necessity of "a good conscience" is more prominent than before.

It is interesting further to notice a slight change in St. Paul's language, which escapes notice in the English translation. Whereas in the earlier Epistles, when he spoke of

"good works," he used a phrase which implied moral goodness—ἔργα ἀγαθά (Eph. ii. 10: *cf.* Rom. ii. 10, xiii. 3; 2 Cor. ix. 8; Col. i. 10), here his favourite phrase implies attractiveness (καλὰ ἔργα); works which strike the eye, which arrest the passer-by, which cannot be hid (1 Tim. v. 25).

It is perhaps precarious to press this distinction too far, but the distinction is real elsewhere in the New Testament,* and it can scarcely be an accident that it occurs so often in these Epistles, and that not only in the phrase "good works," but in other contexts and in compound words.

No *one* English word can express it, as will be seen by some of the places in which it is found. Thus "Every creature of God

* *Cf.* St. Matt. v. 16., ὅπως ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα; St. Mark xiv. 6; St. John x. 11, ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός. "The 'good' is not only good inwardly (ἀγαθός), but good as perceived (καλός). In the fulfilment of his work the Good Shepherd claims the admiration of all that is generous in man." (WESTCOTT.) Note that the Good Shepherd was probably the first aspect of our Lord that was expressed in Christian Art.

is *good*" (καλόν, 1 Tim. iv. 4; *cf.* Gen. i. 31), free from defilement, fit for human use, with the stamp of the Creator's hand upon it. "The law is good" (καλός, 1 Tim. i. 8), *i.e.* valuable, an excellent instrument in the teacher's hands if he use it in accordance with its true spirit. If a person desire a bishopric he sets his heart on "a good work" (καλοῦ ἔργου, iii. 1), an honourable task, a post that places him before the world's eyes and requires constant labour; he must have ruled his own family well (καλῶς, iii. 4), with dignity and success (*cf.* v. 17); he must have an excellent reputation from those without (μαρτυρίαν καλήν, iii. 7); the deacon who gains distinction (καλῶς) in his diaconate acquires a distinguished position (βαθμὸν καλόν) for further work (iii. 13; *cf.* iv. 6).

The widow must not only have followed every good work (παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ), but be well reported of for striking deeds of charity (ἔργοις καλοῖς, 1 Tim. v. 9, 10). The Christian minister has to endure hardness as a first-

rate soldier (*καλὸς στρατιώτης*, 2 Tim. ii. 2), engaged in the noble struggle (*τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα*, 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7), in the truly honourable campaign (*τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν*, 1 Tim. i. 18), which implies loyal obedience to the orders given to him, and which has "its victories no less renowned than war." The doctrine which he preaches is attractive and winning (*τῆς καλῆς διδασκαλίας*, 1 Tim. iv. 6; *cf.* Titus ii. 4), with the glow of healthy life upon it. Timothy's public profession of his faith had something heroic about it, as had that of his Master before Pontius Pilate (*τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν*, 1 Tim. vi. 12–13). Titus is to be an ensample to the whole Church of excellent works (*καλῶν ἐργῶν*, Tit. ii. 7); the rich are not only to do good (*ἀγαθοεργεῖν*), but to use their wealth on works of special excellence (*ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς*), and thereby they lay up for themselves a good foundation (*καλὸν*), one well-laid, polished, symmetrical, the worthy base on which an eternal life may be built up (1 Tim. vi. 18, 19). All "our people,"

all the members of the Christian family (*οἱ ἡμέτεροι*) are to maintain, to take the lead in honest, honourable occupations (*καλῶν ἐργῶν προίστασθαι*, Titus iii. 14), for this was the natural duty of those who believe in God (iii. 8), the very purpose for which God had purified unto Himself a peculiar people, that they might be zealous for works that should rise above the level of the world and exhibit the beauty of holiness (*ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων*, ii. 14).

Such is the last touch which St. Paul's hand gives to his sketch of Christian morality; it is to have a touch of beauty in it to attract the world by its intrinsic loveliness; and this has grown out of an enforcement of law, duty, conscience, submission, on hearts that are under the sway of love.

A morality which is not as that of the heathen, not as that of the Jew; a morality which is that of sons of daylight, with nothing to hide, of sons of God, of children of His love, of grown-up men, of members

of the body of Christ; a morality which draws within its sway the personal life of the Christian, his family relations, his acts as a citizen, his relation to other members of the Church and to those outside the Church; a morality which grows through self-discipline and control into an attractive beauty;—this is what St. Paul lays down as his ideal; such good works are not inconsistent with justification by faith; they are the natural outcome of an allegiance to such a Master. "This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works."

Two thoughts emerge very prominently from the considerations put forward in these lectures. The one is the tendency of the Christian life to pass from enthusiastic impulse into regulated and disciplined movement; the mighty rushing wind of Pente-

cost becomes the quiet force that moves the corporate, disciplined, officered Churches; the personal allegiance of faith, accepting a new Master with an absolute devotion, becomes the power which enables the disciple to mould the quiet details of daily life, in all its many sides, upon the pattern of duty; and these thoughts may help us still in our conception of missionary work, in our ecclesiastical perplexities, and in the ordering of our own lives and of those entrusted to our care.

The other thought is the *constructive* genius of St. Paul. "He it was," said Origen,* "who, after Jesus, laid firm the foundation of the Churches that are in Christ"; his Roman citizenship and Greek training led him to welcome the Roman imperial system as the instrument, and even in some respect the model for the Christian Church; his heart was enlarged to embrace both Jew and Gentile alike, and to knit them together in the service of the common

* *Contra Celsum* i. 63.

Lord; his spiritual reality made him seize on the sense of dependence upon a power higher than oneself as the central feature of religion; his practical wisdom saw that Christian faith must work itself out by love, and that love meant the fulfilling of the law. It is to a fuller conception of his teaching —a fresh study of his Epistles to see whether these things are so, that I invite you, only asking St. Paul's Master and mine to forgive me if I have said any word unworthy of him whom, though he was in his own estimate less than the least of all saints, history has proved to be as great as the greatest of them, the wisest of all the master-builders of Christendom, both in the way in which he laid the foundation and in the structure which he reared upon it.

Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome and London

DATE DUE

THE KING'S LIBRARY
3000027638